

Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations

Examination – July 2016

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

As agreed between:

Winchester City Council

&

Bloombridge (51939)

concerning

Policy CC1: Sandyfields Housing Allocation

Library Reference : WCC SCG 03



Winchester
City Council

Introduction

Purpose of Statement

This statement is to inform the Inspector and other parties of the areas of agreement between Winchester City Council (WCC) and Bloombridge on matters relating to the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Site Allocations concerning Policy CC1: Sandyfields Housing Allocation.

Matters of Agreement

Policy Context

Policies as set out in Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 Joint Core Strategy (LPP1) which provide the context, including:

DS1 – Development Strategy and Principles

MTRA1 – Development Strategy for Market Towns and Rural Area

MTRA2 – Market Towns and Larger Villages – about 250 new homes in Colden Common

CP1 – Housing Provision

CP2 – Housing Mix

CP3 – Affordable Housing

CP7 – Open Space, Sport & Recreation

CP10 – Transport

CP11 – Sustainable Low and Zero Carbon Built Development

CP13 – High Quality Design

CP14 – Effective Uses of Land

CP15 – Green Infrastructure

CP16 – Biodiversity

CP17 - Flooding and Water Environment

CP19 – South Downs National Park

CP20 – Heritage and Landscape Character

CP21 – Infrastructure and Community Benefit

Sources of Housing Supply for Colden Common (at 31.03.15)

Category	No. of dwellings
b. Net Completions 1.4.2011 to 31.3.2015	4
c. Outstanding permissions at 31.3.2015	28
d. SHLAA sites within settlement boundary	53
e. Windfall allowance	0
f. Total supply (b+c+d+e)	85

Evidence Studies

- Transport Accessibility Assessment (September 2013 and September 2015) – overall accessibility rating (sites' proximity using average

walking distances from the furthest section of the site) to the range of services considered is “adequate” falling within the range 800m-1600m. Individual ratings are public transport within 400m (excellent), local centre shops and facilities 1200m and primary school 1200m (adequate). Concludes for 275: “**No overriding issues**. However, this is a significant sized site and is considered as only having 'adequate' access to shops, facilities and schools and therefore sites with better access may be considered to be preferable.”

- Landscape Sensitivity Appraisal – assessed as “***moderately sensitive*** as an existing caravan storage area, existing development and land with planning permission.”
- Historic Environment Assessment –site is located on / close to the gravel terraces and therefore has archaeological potential for previously unrecognised remains and features associated with prehistoric occupation in this area (“amber flag”). Grade II listed Manor House, Granary and Barn north of site – flagged “green/amber” as plenty of trees surround their setting so unlikely for harmful impacts from development.
- Open Space (September 2015) – there are shortfalls in several categories of public open space at Colden Common against Policy CP7 requirement, namely equipped children’s play (-1.36ha), informal green space (-2.02ha), natural green space (-1.04ha), parks & recreation grounds (-1.63ha). There is a small surplus in allotments (0.07ha) and a considerable surplus in sports grounds (5.32ha).

Community Consultation

- Colden Common Engagement Workshop held on 9 February 2013 by Commonview. Results report presented to Colden Common Parish Council (CCPC) 6 March 2013, distributed to participants, on display at Community Centre and CCPC’s website. Results show support for 97 units at Sandyfields.
- Presentation by Commonview and WCC to CCPC Annual Assembly on 29 May 2013 followed by three week period for people to submit comments in writing.
- Commonview met developers promoting sites on 18 June 2013 and set out preferences and wishes of residents from the consultation exercises.
- Commonview Engagement Day 21 July 2013 for developers to set out their plans and for people to have the opportunity to record their views. Over 500 people attended and 279 questionnaires were completed by a range of residents around the village. Residents were asked whether they strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree with a number of statements concerning the impacts of each of the sites.

- The Commonview work was brought together at a workshop on 10 September 2013 attended by WCC, Parish and Commonview representatives. Comments on individual sites are set out in notes of the meeting (document EBCC18 in Examination Library). The meeting reached the following conclusions:
 - The community's preferences for sites, as expressed through the residents' survey and earlier consultation, pointed towards a strategy with focus on sites to the east and west of Main Road.
 - There was no clear consensus on preferred sites, but several options arose. Site 275 (Sandyfields) is a clear favourite with the community, followed by sites 888/889. Site 2495 is put forward in combination with 275. Site 2494 is identified as a means of making up the shortfall of around 40 dwellings.
 - For 275, "landscape officer agreed that the site's sensitivity rating on part of the site could be revised from 'high' to 'moderate' as planning permission had been granted to extend the caravan storage area".
 - 1871 was described as "a natural extension to the village" and 2494 as "visually prominent on north entry to village and fears of creeping into the gap".
 - It was noted that Commonview will refine site options for further discussion.
- Development strategy made available to community at a drop-in event on 29 September 2013 and following Parish Council meeting on 2 October 2013 available for written comments until 30 November 2013. There were 30 responses from residents: 13 supported the Village Development Strategy (paragraph 10 Report to CCPC 03/03/14) with most of the rest objecting to sites 2494 or 1874.
- WCC has had one meeting with Bloombridge, on 3 October 2013. No further engagement was necessary as the Development Strategy for Colden Common was effectively set from this date. Aggrieved parties were informed that they could put their case to the LPP2 EIP.
- The revised Development Strategy was presented to the Parish Council Meeting on 3 March 2014 by Commonview, with Mr Opacic (WCC, Head of Strategic Planning) leading the Q&A. The revised Development Strategy increased the housing allocation for Sandyfields from 120 units to 165. Paragraphs 11 to 13 of the Revised Colden Common Development Strategy explain how and why Site 2494 was abandoned and the additional homes added to Sandyfields. Paragraph 12 states that from "draft layouts put forward, it is evident that a development of up to 165 homes can be achieved and would accord fully with the

requirements of Local Plan Part 1 in terms of affordable housing, open space, design, sustainable construction etc.”

- Draft LPP2 (and supporting documents) published for consultation from 24 October to 5 December 2014, including exhibition at Colden Common Community Centre on 14 November 2014. 180 respondents made 242 comments concerning Colden Common. On policy CC1, 26 respondents made comments in support and 26 respondents raised objections. (See report CAB2670(LP) to Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee 12 March 2015 – WCC1.
- Publication (Pre-Submission) LPP2 and supporting documents published for comments from 6 November to 21 December 2015.

Description of Site

This site is located on the eastern edge of Colden Common, outside the settlement boundary as defined on the adopted Policies Map, to the north east of the B3354 Main Road. Only a small section of the site fronts Main Road and this contains the existing vehicular access, a garden centre (now closed), parking forecourt and a residential property no. 111 Main Road. Three further dwellings and some nursery buildings are set back into the site.

The rest of the site is set back from the road behind these buildings and Glen Park Mobile Home Park and there is a bank of trees separating the mobile park from the site. The northern part of the land is used for the storage of touring caravans (c500 pitches). The southern part of the land is currently an open field which also has permission to be used for the storage of mobile homes or caravans.

To the north of the site are paddocks and to the east is a section of woodland known as Stratton's Copse. The copse is part of larger area of woodland the whole of which is classified as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) and is designated Ancient Woodland, part semi-natural and part replanted. Stratton's Copse to the east and land to the north of the woodland are within the South Downs National Park (SDNP), but the field immediately to the north and the Colden Common Park (Playing Field) beyond is not within the SDNP. There is a telecommunications mast within Stratton's Copse.

To the north west of the site is Colden Common Farm which includes a Grade II listed Manor House, Granary and Barn. Trees and other buildings lie between the listed buildings and Sandyfields.

The boundaries of the site are generally enclosed by hedgerows and deciduous trees. The land is fairly flat and mostly open within the site, apart from a line of trees and hedgerow dividing the caravan park from the southern field and a less substantial line of planting running east-west across the middle of the caravan park.

Sandyfields is 1200m from the Co-op and School, and 920m from Colden Common Park, requiring a 150-300m walk up Main Road.

Planning History

Planning history of Site 275:

86/00566/OLD - Use of land for storage of touring caravans. Permitted 24th June 1986.

91/00481/OLD - Use of land for storage of caravans, alterations to access. Permitted 26th March 1991.

91/00482/OLD - Change of use of land for storage and extension to car park. Permitted 29th May 1991.

95/00475/OLD - New vehicular access and closure of existing vehicular access. Permitted 3rd July 1995.

97/01080/TCP - Erection of free standing 15 metre high pole with 3 no cross polar sector antennas and dish antenna, equipment cabin and ancillary equipment. Permitted 10th July 1997.

98/01618/CHU - Change of use from agricultural land to open storage for touring caravans. Permitted 4th December 1998.

01/02056/FUL - Telecommunications equipment comprising 22.5 metre high lattice tower, antennae and associated equipment cabinets, concrete bases and compound. Permitted 19th October 2001.

11/01153/FUL - Change of use of existing field to caravan and mobile home storage site (B8); to provide an additional 196 spaces to the existing caravan and mobile home storage facility and erection of a new office building. Permitted 24th November 2011.

12/02370/FUL - Demolition of existing nursery building and erection of 4 no. three bedroom dwellings with associated parking. Refused 22nd April 2013. Dismissed at appeal.

14/00179/SCREEN - Request for a screening opinion under the EIA Regulations for proposed residential development comprising in the region of 150 dwellings. Not Required 11th February 2014.

14/01993/OUT – 165 dwellings and associated works (outline) - amended plans including revised indicative site layout for up to 165 dwellings, landscape strategy and other supporting documents.

The Sandyfields planning application was submitted in August 2014. This initially received objections from County Highways, County Ecology, WCC

Trees, WCC Landscape & POS (5 October 2015) and the South Downs National Park Authority (11 December 2015). In July 2015 WCC's Design Review Panel raised concern regarding whether the number of units proposed could be achieved on the site in a satisfactory way and suggested that there was a need to demonstrate that a development of sufficient quality could be provided (see Annex D).

A revised scheme was therefore submitted in March 2016, with an updated transport assessment, taking Strattons Copse (Ancient Woodland) out of the redline, including a revised master plan and 1.3 ha of public open space on site, and with further ecological work on bats, badgers, grass snakes, GCN and dormice. WCC Highways advised highway advice must be provided by HCC; WCC Ecology and Landscape raised no objections. An objection from the South Downs National Park Authority ("SDNPA") was received on 21 April 2016.

Resolution to grant permission 21st April 2016 subject to S106 agreement, with outstanding highway issues at Hampshire County Council (HCC) delegated to Head of Development Management to resolve.

Secretary of State decided not to call in this application – letter dated 24 May 2016.

Planning history of Site 2495:

79/01468/OLD – Erection of dwelling and garage adjacent to 'The Gorse' (Outline). Refused 21st August 1979.

Proposed Development

About 165 dwellings, as proposed by Policy CC1 of the LPP2, on combined SHLAA Sites 275 and 2495.

SDNPA Comments on Policy CC1

The South Downs National Park Authority as adjoining authority was invited (email 11 February 2013) to meet City Council officers to discuss cross-boundary issues (Duty to Co-operate Statement – OD6). The SDNPA was also invited to attend all the Parish Council workshops during September 2013 but chose only to attend the Swanmore event. A report from SDNPA's Landscape Officer Veronica Craddock in October 2013 describes Sandyfields as a "complex site". She commented on all sites, save 1871/2561, and agreed with WCC assessment of moderate sensitivity for Site 275.

Comments submitted to Publication (Pre-Submission) LPP2 state, "the NPA welcomes the policy requirement to promote a housing density and layout which respects the location of the site in relation to the National Park." The suggested amendment is that, "This (Stratton Copse is designated as a SINC, is home to protected species, contains semi-natural ancient woodland and is

within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone) should be referenced in paragraph 4.3.15 and addressed through appropriate policy criteria.”

Matters in Dispute


The matters in dispute are summarised in the questions which, following the Programme Officer’s email of 13 May 2016, the Inspector has agreed can be discussed at the session on 19 July 2016.

- a. Whether the local engagement exercise that underpinned Policy CC1 is sufficiently robust, providing results that justify the policy on the evidence, having regard for reasonable alternatives.
- b. Whether the rationale for focusing development on Sandyfields Nursery is justified by the evidence, having regard for reasonable alternatives.
- c. Whether the proposed allocation is in conformity with LPP1, including Policies CP7 (accessibility to POS and addressing the 4 ha shortfall), CP10 (accessibility criteria), CP15 and CP19 (development in the national interest)
- d. Whether the proposed density is appropriate and necessary, having regard for the evidence and the availability of reasonable alternatives.
- e. Whether an assessment of the impact on the National Park and Ancient Woodland been undertaken and whether this nationally significant landscape resource been accorded appropriate weight, including with regard to national policies.
- f. Whether the policy is likely to be effective given that part of the site lies within the jurisdiction of the South Downs National Park Authority and there is a need to find a site to relocate the storage of 500 caravans.

Declaration

The contents of this document are as agreed for the purpose of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 Examination.

Signed on behalf of participant

A rectangular box containing a solid black rectangle, used to redact a signature.

Name: Richard A Cutler BSc (Hons) MSc MRICS MRTPI MBA

Position: Partner, Bloombridge LLP

Date: 7 July 2016

Signed on behalf of Winchester City Council



Name: Steven Opacic Dip TP, MRTPI

Position: Head of Strategic Planning

Date: 7 July 2016

Annex A.

In response to the questions Mr Cutler wrote on 9 June 2016:

Question a.

BB have evidenced a 18 September 2013 email from Gareth Williams (Lead Officer on Colden Common for LPP2) stating that the Commonview questionnaire and results are “flawed” and should be “treated with considerable caution”. BB commissioned a report from Dr Robert Harris (letter dated 16 May 2016) that supports this opinion. For Colden Common, the local engagement exercise was not robust and the results cannot be relied upon. The results better support a dispersed growth strategy, which was one of the main outcomes of the first Commonview consultation exercise in February 2013. The anomaly here is further illustrated by the fact that Commonview only ever assessed 141 units on a combined 1871/2561, so, for example, a smaller scheme on 1871 was never included in the engagement exercise.

Question b.

BB note that Sites 1871/2561 are ranked as “green” in all categories in the initial sieve analysis. Sandyfields is ranked “amber” on natural designations. Accessibility and the National Park were not included in the initial sieve. BB contend that WCC did not assess reasonable alternatives (such as 1871/2561) when 45 units were added to Sandyfields after the November 2013 consultation and the Sustainability Appraisal also did not undertake a comparative assessment of sites with sustainable development in mind, as it is required to do [see diagram in PPG].

Whilst WCC is seeking to rely on the ‘evidence’ of the 21 April 2016 Committee resolution, it is clear from the application process that evidence supporting 165 units at Sandyfields was not available at the time that policy decisions were made (as evidenced by the planning objections that existed until March 2016, a number of which remain unresolved, including highways and the SDNPA).

Question c.

BB contend that Sandyfields is not in conformity with LPP1 Policies CP7, CP10 and CP19.

With regard to CP7, WCC’s Open Space Strategy (September 2015) notes shortfalls in Colden Common of equipped children’s play (1.36 ha), informal green space (2.02 ha), natural green space (1.04 ha) and parks & recreation grounds (1.62 ha). This totals 6.04 ha. The Open Space Strategy states that “the proposed housing allocations will provide an opportunity for additional on-site provision of open space to meet current and future needs” and paragraph 7.46 of LPP1 states that the plan will seek “local improvements where deficiencies have been identified in particular types of facility, when measured against the new standards” Policy CP7 and the initial (February 2013) Commonview work endorse this approach.

At 165 units, applying the English average household size of 2.4, it is clear that Sandyfields will generate 396 people. Applying the the 4 ha per 1000

population figure in Table 1 of CP7, this generates a requirement for 1.58 ha of POS for Sandyfields to accommodate the needs of development. There is 1.3 ha provided on site, so it is actually adding to the shortfall. The 'woodland walk' (given the reservations expressed by Natural England and SDNPA) cannot on its own make up the shortfall. Moreover, with the Recreation Ground and Colden Common Park in the north of the village, one of the original aims of the Commonview work was to create some comparable POS to the south.

With regard to CP10, Sandyfields does not have "good" accessibility and the transport mitigation works are still unspecified. In contrast, 1871/2561 have good accessibility and the County Highway Authority has raised no objection to the application for 21 units on 1871.

With regard to CP19, 1871/2561 have no impact on the National Park.

Question d.

BB contend that WCC should not have increased the density of Sandyfields to 165 units following the November 2013 consultation. It cannot resolve the shortfall in POS in Colden Common at this density, it impacts adversely (and unnecessarily) on the Ancient Woodland, and it puts too many people in a location that does not have good accessibility to local services. 21 or 45 units at 1871/2561 is demonstrably a better alternative, which, according to the notes of the 10 September 2013 workshop is a "natural extension to the settlement boundary".

Question e.

WCC have not undertaken an assessment based on paragraphs 115 and 116 of the NPPF, affording the National Park "great weight", and has not published an assessment based on Natural England's Standing Advice on Ancient Woodlands or LPP1 Policy CP19. ,

Question f.

BB point to the September 2015 SHLAA (Table 9) which states that Sandyfields is not available for development until 2020+. This is because finding an acceptable replacement site for the storage of 500 caravans may take some time. It is also unclear how the 'woodland walk' will be delivered, as this will require planning permission from SDNPA for the change of use and proposed operational development.

Annex B.

In an email response to Mr Cutler, Miss Jewell wrote on 22 June 2016:

The local engagement exercises undertaken in 2013 were carried out by Commonview and documents relating to this are published on the Colden Common Parish Council website. They are not WCC documents but are referenced in WCC's Housing Site Assessment Methodology (2014) paper (now in the examination library, document EBT4) – see list of references that is headed "Parish Council documents and publications from Parish Council websites". The Colden Common page of the 'Background Work With Parishes on LPP2' section <http://www.winchester.gov.uk/planning-policy/local-plan-part-2/background-work-with-parishes-on-lpp2/colden-common/> already has a link to the Parish Council's website (see Commonview tab). Where I am referencing them in my statement I can ask for them to be added to the Examination Library or attach as appendices. I note that you have appended Commonview's questionnaire and report of the 21 July 2013 event.

From the time that WCC engaged with the Parish Council in January 2013 various information was provided to assist the Parish Council and Commonview with its work on assessing the sites and undertaking the community engagement. For example a draft version of the Colden Common Profile Data (on the above page and Exam Lib EBCC14) was provided in January 2013. This document includes a map illustrating location of the SDNP, SINC's and Ancient Woodland and also has a section entitled "What makes Colden Common special" which draws from the VDS. Documents that were provided to the Parish Council ahead of the September 2013 workshop were generally published on WCC's website around that time. The consolidated Constraints Map (Oct 2013 version) was not uploaded until July 2015 after it was noticed that it was missing from the web page however earlier versions were available for the 10 September 2013 workshop. [The version last modified 22/08/13 was replaced by the version last modified 06/09/13 to which TPOs (previously on a separate map) were added. The notation was amended again on the 17/10/13 version – colours changed and TPO notation added to the key.]

The Commonview consultation workshop in February 2013 contained three exercises; 1. What is important to you? 2. What are the development needs of your community? 3. Where should this development take place? For the third exercise a map of the SHLAA sites was available which included at Church Lane the site 1871, but not site 2561 as 2561 had not been put forward at that stage.

Exercise 1 sought to identify residents' most important priorities and apply them to any new development. These were taken from the VDS and included such as "To conserve the landscapes on the perimeter of the SDNP". "Conserve important local views" then "Scale and density in character with the village" were the top priorities.

Exercise 2 used hypothetical, typical resident figures to aid consideration of housing, employment and social needs in the village over the next 20 years

and for the latter this revealed participants considered more buses, doctor/dentist and sufficient school places to be the most important.

Exercise 3 included participants placing different coloured sticky dots on a map to indicate an area they considered not suitable for development, areas they considered suitable or may be suitable for development. Sandyfields is clearly in front of the other sites considered 'suitable' with 1871 well down the list. Sandyfields is still in front of the 'may be suitable' sites with 1871 in fourth position. While the dots were spread among several sites this does not support a 'dispersal strategy' as the outcome simply indicates the degree of suitability participants attached to the various sites. Neither the report of the event nor the subsequent Parish Council minutes say that dispersal of small sites throughout the village was the original preference expressed by Commonview in February 2013.

The initial site sieve exercise (EBCC13) (Version 2 issued May 2013 – an earlier version was supplied to the Parish Councils for their use) was a high level RAG assessment as described in the paper EBT4. It included a number of constraint topics but not all the criteria that formed part of the comparative assessment of alternative sites, e.g. whether the site is previously developed.

The combined site 1871/2561 was included at the July 2013 event as you had asked (8 April 2013) to increase the size of site previously submitted then supplied (15 May 2013) a concept plan with Phase 1 (site 1871) 25 units and Phase 2 (site 2561) 120 units.

The email from Gareth Williams that, "the conclusions set out beneath the chart of results (slide 4 of the presentation) are flawed" refers to the way the results have been expressed rather than there being fundamental errors in the analysis of the data. The wording under the chart was therefore changed from "Prominently 275 and 888 would not adversely impact local views and rural identity" to "Prominently development of 275 and 888 were considered by Residents to not adversely impact local views and rural identity." Mr Williams also advised that the residents' opinions needed to be seen in the context of a wide range of other factors to be taken into account in deciding on development options. In the report you supplied from Ramidus Consulting Limited, Dr Harris confirms that the data (for Questions 1-5) "has been processed without major errors". The comment in relation to the summary bar chart that removing certain sites that were ahead of site 2561 (including 2389 because it is a SINC and 2494 because it was rejected by the November 2013 consultation, and others) makes site 2561 "the next plausible in line" should not be an automatic assumption. The validity of simply removing the options ahead of site 2561 to make it second to Sandyfields is questionable and in any case respondents choices may have varied if presented with a different set of options. Regarding the concluding statements in the penultimate slide, even if there is not a significant difference between the top few sites it is clear that site 275 came ahead of the others in all but the accessibility consideration. While site 275 may be further from Colden Common Park than the 650m in Table 1 of Policy CP7, it is much closer than most of the sites including site 2561 which is the furthest away from these sports facilities and pitches.

As referred to above, various evidence and information was available to Commonview, including the initial SA and the results from the public consultation events, to inform the recommendations to the Parish Council on 2 October 2013 (which was preceded by an exhibition drop-in event held on 29 September). The further consultation that followed, extended to 30 November 2013, did not elicit many responses but that does not mean the outcome is not valid. One respondent expressed surprise at the need to write in support of the development strategy when they had already been involved and had made their contributions, stating, "If people are not happy they normally do something about it – not the other way around." Of the 30 residents who responded (the other 2 responses were from developers) almost half positively supported the Village Development Strategy and those who raised objections to the strategy did so with regard to the inclusion of site 2494, except one objection to sites 888/889. A number commented on the preference of using brownfield rather than greenfield sites and/or against site 1874 on which the developers had undertaken further consultation. Further consultation was carried out through the publication of the Consultation Draft Plan, the outcome of which is already referred to in my edited draft of the SOCG.

Regarding the statistical validity of the number of people responding to any consultation event, people are not forced or obligated to engage or comment. Even with a neighbourhood plan the referendum result is based on the proportion of residents who voted, not on the number of residents entitled to vote in the area.

With site 275 selected as the main location, when further dialogue with the planning consultants for the owners and the potential developer indicated from draft layouts that the balance of development required from LPP1 (165 dwellings) could be accommodated then the less popular site 2494 was no longer necessary. Further testing of different layouts has been carried out to overcome the various concerns expressed, including those of the Design Review Panel on 16 July 2015, to ensure that the constraints of wildlife habitat and foraging, the safeguarding of the pipeline and the level of open space required by the development can be met on site to advise the Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee on 16 September 2015 and the Planning Committee on 21 April 2016. The Design Review Panel did not say that the number could not be achieved but were concerned about the quality of the development that could be provided, hence further work was undertaken and subsequently published for consultation on the planning application prior to the Planning Committee meeting.

Assessments of the alternative sites were carried out but are not written up in the same format as your submission. The SA/SEA (updated as the LPP2 progressed) assessed the sites against the SA objectives, with the key effects and mitigation recommendations of specific sites set out in the individual settlement commentary sections – see documents SA1/SUB4 (table 4.2 for Colden Common), SA3 (table 4.2 for Colden Common) and SA5c. This issue is not specific to Colden Common and is being considered under Matter 1. The report to the Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee 16 September 2015

(WCC3) in Appendix 1 to Appendix C of CAB2711 includes a comparative assessment of the alternative sites. The existence of the SDNP and the Ancient Woodland is referenced in several data sources and shown on maps and has specific mention in the Landscape Sensitivity Appraisal and is addressed in WCC3. Dialogue with the SDNPA has dealt with this and while some specific issues were raised which resulted in an objection to the planning application (e.g. reduce the number of houses applied for as a small number will be delivered adjacent but outside the application site, the lack of a lighting strategy; and requested deferral for more time to consider the ecological aspects of the woodland) no fundamental objection has been raised to Policy CC1.

Finally, I thank you for clarifying your measurement of distances to certain facilities, as illustrated on your walkability map, and your acknowledgement that there is a public footpath route from Sandyfields to the school that requires just a c100m walk up Main Road.

Attached to email to Ian Donohue 11/8/15



WINCHESTER WITH EASTLEIGH DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting: 16.07.2015

Site: Sandyfields Nurseries, Main Road, Colden Common

Proposal: 165 no. dwellings and associated works (outline application)

Planning reference: 14/01993/OUT

Design Review Panel Members sitting on the Panel: Ian Deans, David Gregory and Mark Waller-Gutierrez

Council Officers in attendance: Bev Harding-Rennie and Michelle Thomson

Item presented by: Steve Carrington, Foreman Homes and Ian Donohue, Southern Planning Practice

Declarations of Interest declared: None

Comments:

The Panel felt that the site should not be driven by numbers alone and noted that the developable area had shrunk. Concern was raised regarding whether the number of units proposed could be achieved on the site in a satisfactory way and the Panel suggested that there was a need to demonstrate that a development of sufficient quality could be provided.

The Panel felt that there was a need to articulate the design intent and demonstrate how this would be delivered on the site, first establishing the site's constraints and opportunities which should logically inform an appropriate and attractive design solution which would determine the appropriate number of units.

The Panel felt that there was a lack of clarity regarding the character areas within the scheme and considered that with the exception of the detached dwellings in the northern part of the site, the remainder was similar in character.

The Panel queried how the parking areas would be integrated and raised concern regarding the impact of these on the open space. Concern was also raised regarding the how in practice the 'green finger' roads would be

achieved given the very tight space indicated for these features which at the very least would require more space for the proposed trees. The Panel noted that terraces are proposed to the area interfacing with the National Park and that there is no explanation of this area. The Panel also raised concern regarding appropriateness of the large blocks facing on to the relatively small open space.

With regard to the overall design the Panel felt that this was quite urban in form for an edge of village location.

Overall the Panel felt that the scheme was lacking in design coherence and suggested that there is a need to set out the design objectives and then show how this can be achieved in sufficient detail, for example width of roads, location of trees and principles of character areas. The proposed concept and explanation of how this is carried out on the site would then underpin the numbers proposed.